

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 25 April 2007. Responsive to that Office Action, former Claims 14, 19-21 and 25 include allowable subject matter. Claim 13 is now amended to adopt the Examiner's suggestion by incorporating the additional limitations of former Claim 14. Similarly, Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the further limitations of former Claims 13 and 15, and Claim 24 has been amended to incorporate the further limitations of former Claim 25. As these limitations are incorporated into Claims 13, 19 and 24, and since Claims 20 and 21 which were objected to depend from Claim 19 which has now been amended, it places this application in condition for allowance. It is believed that with such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, Claims 6-12 and 22-23 are allowable over the prior art of record. The Examiner also indicated allowable subject matter for Claims 14, 19-21, and 25, merely objecting to them for being dependent upon one or more rejected base claims, but stating that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, the limitations of Claims 14 and 25 are now incorporated into independent Claims 13 and 24, respectively. Claims 14 and 25 are now canceled.

Claims 15-17, which depended on former Claim 13, and which the Examiner rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Pondman

reference, are canceled. The Examiner also rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Pondman reference and it is canceled.

As newly-amended independent Claim 13 now more clearly recites, the breakaway support recited in that Claim includes among its combination of features a support connector attached to the supporting structure for securing the assembly to the supporting structure. The structure includes an overhead line connection point, and a stranded link member secured to the support connector at one end and secured to the overhead line connection point at the other end. As newly-amended independent Claim 13 also now more clearly recites, a means for controlling the level of force at which the link member will yield, so as to allow the, link member will yield when force in excess of the tensile strength of the link member is applied to the overhead line connection point.

In contradistinction, the Pondman reference is directed to a structure for fastening a pipe. The structure includes the rod-shaped unit 4 is connected through universal pivotal coupling 9, with the fastening means 5 and, through universal pivotal coupling 10, also with circular element 6. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest the stranded link member secured to the support connector at one end and secured to the overhead line connection point at the other end, where a means for controlling the level of force at which the link member will yield, as claimed.

Claim 19 has been amended to include all of the limitation of former Claim 13, as well as former intervening Claim 15, from which former Claim 19

depended. As newly-amended Claim 19 now more clearly recites, the breakaway support recited in that Claim includes among its combination of features a support connector attached to the supporting structure for securing the assembly to the supporting structure. The structure includes an overhead line connection point, and a stranded link member secured to the support connector at one end and secured to the overhead line connection point at the other end. It also includes a stabilizing assembly comprising a generally oval shaped metal component and a nipple protruding from the component such that the nipple prevents abrasion of the link member.

As newly-amended independent Claim 24 now more clearly recites, the single use breakaway support assembly for securing overhead lines to a supporting breakaway element that has a lower tensile strength than the other components of the breakaway support assembly. A break away support assembly has a means for attaching the breakaway element to the overhead lines, and a means for securing the breakaway element to the supporting structure. The structure includes a means for controlling the level of force at which the breakaway element will yield, where the breakaway element will yield upon the application of a load less than that required to damage to the supporting structure, as now claimed. As argued above, these limitations are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by the Pondman reference. Therefore, the applicant's invention is different from the prior art, which makes the applicant's invention patentable.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Pondman reference fails to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

For: GOODMAN, ALLEN FILLETTI PLLC



Charles M. Allen

Registration #41,577

Dated: 5 July 2007

4501 Highwoods Parkway, Suite 210
Glenn Allen, VA 23060
(804) 346-0600